

Remarks

The claims have been rejected as being anticipated by US 2002/0112014 (herein "Bennett"). In her supporting remarks, the Examiner refers in particular to paragraphs 0006, 0007 and 0019 to 0030 of Bennett. These passages have been carefully reviewed, but it is not understood how the Examiner has come to the conclusion that the claims are anticipated. Actually, the only similarity between Bennett and the subject matter of the claims is that they both relate to the field of mobile telecommunications.

Bennett is concerned with providing interconnectivity between multiple networks operating according to different telecommunications standards (e.g. see abstract). This is achieved by employing a central server/hub to convert between different formats of messages as appropriate for different sending and receiving networks (again see abstract, and also paragraph 0028, for example).

In contrast, the apparatus and method set forth the claims is concerned with a completely different aspect of telecommunication networks. In particular, applicant's apparatus and method are concerned with adding flexibility to the otherwise relatively restrictive alphanumeric destination address feature of various telecommunication standards. More specifically, the present invention is directed to providing a mechanism whereby a sender of an SMS message may specify a short-form alphanumeric destination address within an SMS destination field, and have this converted to a full destination address in accordance with a predefined syntax by a telecommunications service apparatus within the network (as set out in claim 37).

For example, and referring to page 5, lines 11 to 20, a short form alphanumeric SMS destination address of "*jsmith@*" could be used to effect delivery of an SMS message by email to a full destination address of "*jsmith@hotmail.com*". Significantly, the full destination address in this example comprises 18 characters, which would be too many to be specified in an SMS destination address according to the current GSM standard, for example. The short-form alphanumeric SMS destination address (*jsmith@*), on the other hand, comprises only 8 characters, and so can be entered as a destination address in conformance with existing telecommunications standards.

Bennett has not been found to contain anything that bears any relation to this. Accordingly, Bennett does not disclose many of the features of claim 37. For example, Bennett does not disclose routing based on identifying a characteristic in a message signal where the characteristic is the use of an alphanumeric form of destination

address in an SMS destination field. Neither does Bennett disclose translating a short-form destination address to a full destination address using a predefined syntax. Claim 37 is thus novel over Bennett at least by virtue of these features.

Furthermore, Bennett is so fundamentally different from the present invention (e.g. Bennett does not relate in any way to alphanumeric destination addresses in an SMS destination field), that there is nothing in Bennett that would lead the skilled person to modify Bennett in such a way as to arrive at the subject matter of the claims. Accordingly, the apparatus and method recited in the claims are not obvious from Bennett.

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Don W. Bulson/

By

Don W. Bulson, Reg. No. 28,192

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

M:\D\YOU\IP\0289\IP0289US-R01.wpd